

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/678,378	10/02/2003	Philip T. Ward	30859 CNT1	4032	
23589 7	7590 05/03/2004		EXAMINER		
HOVEY WILLIAMS LLP			NGUYEN, CHI Q		
2405 GRAND BLVD., SUITE 400 KANSAS CITY, MO 64108			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	-, · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		3635	3635	
			DATE MAIL ED: 05/02/200	DATE MAIL ED: 05/02/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/678,378	WARD, PHILIP T.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
•	Chi Q Nguyen	3635				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresp ndence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>03</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 October 2003.						
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
• 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are rejected.						
7)☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>02 October 2003</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Tice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	atent Application (PTO-152)					
rademark Office						

ev. 1-04)

Application/Control Number: 10/678,378

Art Unit: 3635

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-13 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-57 of U.S. Patent No. 6,655,650. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the scope of the patented claims appears to be the same as the application claims. Specifically, the patented independent claims 1, 11, 22, 28, 41, and 47 are corresponding to the instant application's claim 1 except for the term variations such as "a load-bearing face plate" instead of "a face plate", "a segment of the forming which defines a forward-facing" instead of "structure projecting rearwardly" and "one elongated rail" is not required for the instant application's claim 1. And other claimed limitations in the depending claims 2-13 are corresponding to the patented depending claims 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16.

Art Unit: 3635

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moore (US 6,526,713).

In regard to claim 1, Moore teaches concrete form system comprising a load-bearing face plate 10 having a front face 32, structure 60 projecting rearwardly from the face plate 32, a flexible barrier element 90 mounted on the structure 60 in spaced relationship to the front face (fig. 12). Since Moore teaches claimed limitations for the concrete form system, examiner considers theses structures are inherent capable to receive a poured concrete.

Conclusion

Application/Control Number: 10/678,378

Art Unit: 3635

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Harkenrider (US 5,836,126) teaches concrete structure having flexible members mounted on structures.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Chi Q. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 605-1224, Mon-Thu (7:00-5:30), Fridays off or examiner's supervisor, Carl Friedman can be reached at (703) 308-0839. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-

1113. (-)()

4/28/04

Carl D. Friedman
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3600